DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 357 RC 015 890

AUTHOR Thomas, Donald W.
TITLE Small Town Population Change in Ohio, 1960-1970 and 1970-1980.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Salt Lake City, UT, August 27-30, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Size; *Municipalities; Population Distribution; Population Growth; *Population Trends; *Rural Areas; Rural Population; Trend Analysis; Urban to Rural Migration; Urban to Suburban Migration
IDENTIFIERS Appalachia; *Ohio; *Small Towns

ABSTRACT

This study of population change in Ohio during the 1960s and 1970s analyzed change by size of place and found sharp contrasts between the two decades. Places in metropolitan core counties which had the highest growth rate in the 1960s showed that lowest growth rate in the 1970s. Small towns in fringe metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan counties had higher growth rates in the 1970s, despite the state's overall lower growth and in contrast to the 1960s when Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area core small towns had the best growth and decline. Ohio's 16 Appalachian counties unexpectedly turned from declining population in the 1960s to growth counties in the 1970s with the bulk of growth occurring in places of smallest size. Unincorporated areas showed much higher growth rates in the 1970s than incorporated places in both metropolitan fringe counties and nonmetropolitan counties. Five tables present percentages of population growth, loss, and stability during the two decades by size of place and by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan status, and in rural turnaround countries by size of place, and give a breakdown of 1970 and 1980 population in incorporated and unincorporated areas by metropolitan status. (LFL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272357

SMALL TOWN POULATION CHANGE IN OHIO, 1960-1970 AND 1970-1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald W. Thomas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Donald W. Thomas
Department of Agricultural Economics and
Rural Sociology
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43081

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of
the Rural Sociological Society.
August 27-30, 1986
Salt Lake City, Utah

RC015890

SMALL TOWN POPULATION CHANGE IN OHIO, 1970-1980 AND 1960-1970

Donald W. Thomas
Ohio State University

INTRODUCTION

There has been considerable research and much written on population changes in the 1970-1980 decade, with comparisons to earlier periods. The emphasis of much of this research, particularly by Rural Sociologists, has been on metropolitan-nonmetropolitan comparisons. Most of the work has dealt with aggregate change and change in county populations or groupings of counties. Less analysis has been done on change by size of place, although there has been some work done at the national level on place change. (Fuguitt and Beale 1977; Fuguitt et al 1981; Lichter and Fuguitt 1982; Long 1978, 1981; Long and De Are 1982) For an excellent review of the literature on the rural turnaround, in general, see Fuguitt (1985).

We are presenting here analysis of data on a subset of the national picture, specifically the state of Ohio. This research hopefully will add an additional insight into the population trends of the past 20 years and serve as a benchmark for studying the patterns of change in the 1980's. As a footnote, Ohio has generally been viewed as a fairly representative state for studying demographic phenomena. This results from the heterogenous social, economic and geographical characteristics of the state. Ohio's 16 metropolitan areas contain about three-fourths of the total population of the state, near the national average. The nonmetropolitan areas are a mixture of rural farm (including an area of the corn belt), open country nonfarm and suburban population. The

Appalachian southern and eastern region adds an additional flavor to the heterogenity of Ohio.

The pattern of population change in Ohio was distinctly different in the 1970's, as compared to the previous decade. In the 1960's, Ohio's population grew by 9.7 percent. Only 16 of the state's 88 counties lost population. All of the losing counties were in the Appalachian southern and eastern part of Ohio. By contrast, the state grew by only 1.3 percent between 1970 and 1980. Eight of the nine losing counties were metropolitan core counties. The highest growth was in fringe metropolitan counties and in the Appalachian counties which had lost population in the previous decade.

The main purpose of this paper is to analyze the population change in places, particularly small places, in an effort to detect patterns of change over the two decades. For example, did the growth in the turnaround counties occur in the incorporated places or in the unincorporated areas? What size of place grew the most? Were there differences in place change in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas? This analysis will not only provide insight into the nature of past population change, but will provide a benchmark for assessing the changes occurring in the current decade.

PLACE CHANGE

The U.S. Census enumerated 932 incorporated places that existed in both 1960 and 1970. Of these, 818 or 87.8% were under 10,000 in

population. 965 places existed during the decade of the 1970's. 814 places (84.4%) were under 10,000 in this period. In this analysis, we have defined small towns as those under 10,000 in population. While this is an arbitrary cutting point, it is one that has often been used in previous research on small town population change.

All places were coded for size of place and change was calculated for the two decades. For the original tables, population change was coded into six growth categories and five loss categories. Tables used in this paper have collapsed change into three categories. (See Table 1.) Growth is defined as population increase of 5.0 percent or greater. Loss is defined as population decrease of 5.0 percent or greater. Stable is defined as growth of less than five percent to decline of less than five percent.

Overall results are presented in Table 1 for both decades. In the 1960's, growth was the rule for all size classes except the very smallest towns of under 500 population. Over half the places in the four largest size categories fall in the "grow" category and the results are essentially linear. Even in the smallest places, however, more towns grew (37.9%) than declined (36.0%).

In the 1970's, the growth pattern in small towns reflects the lower growth in Ohio in general. The pattern of growth by size class is still essentially linear and the number of growth towns is greater than loss towns in all sizes except the under 500 class. In the 1970's, however,

the spread between growth and decline places is substantially lower than in the 1960's.

METROPOLITAN VS. NONMETROPOLITAN PLACES

It is well documented that two of the major factors affecting small town population change are size of place and location relative to metropolitan areas. In this section we present an analysis of Ohio towns by metropolitan status and size.

Of methodological interest, we have assigned metropolitan status to each place using the 1974 definition of SMSA. We have also used a classification, a modification of one used by Fuguitt (1976), that distinguishes between size of SMSA and whether or not the town is located in a core or a fringe county of an SMSA. Nonmetropolitan places are differentiated by the size of largest place in the counties in which they are located. (See Table 2)

During the 1970's, the best record is shared by small towns in fringe metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan places. (Table 2) Fringe areas had the highest percentage of places in the "grow" category (42.7%), while nonmetropolitan areas had the lowest percentage of places in the "loss" category. (25.3%) Core counties had the highest percentage of loss and lowest percentage of growth of the three areas.

This is in direct contrast to the record in the the decade of the 1960's. Core small towns had the best record of growth, by far, of all

areas. Nonmetropolitan places fared worst in both the percentages of places growing and declining. It is interesting to note, however, that the percentage of nonmetropolitan places growing in the 1960's is higher than in the 1970's. That is, the growth performance of all three areas declined during the 1970's, but nonmetropolitan towns declined less than than both metropolitan core and fringe towns.

We also find some interesting differences between the two decades when we sort the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas into size classes. In the 1960-70 decade, the best record of growth belonged to places in large core metropolitan areas. (Table 3) Medium core places were second, followed by large fringe places and nonmetropolitan places in counties with the largest size of place. The worst growth record for small towns was found in nonmetropolitan counties where the size of largest of place was under 5,000.

Again, the contrast is noteworthy when these results are compared with the following decade. In the 1970's, places in nonmetropolitan counties with the smallest "largest size of place" had the second best growth record of all categories. Only the medium sized fringe metropolitan areas had a higher percentage of towns growing and fewer declining. The biggest decline in growth performance was in towns in the largest metropolitan areas. Worth noting, in nonmetropolitan areas, is the complete reversal of the pattern of the "size of largest place" pattern. In the 1970's, the smallest category had the best performance

in small town growth, followed by the medium category, and then the largest category. The 1960's results were the direct opposite.

RURAL TURNAROUND COUNTIES

Of particular interest here is the change in small towns in the 16 counties of southern and eastern Ohio which turned around from declining population counties in the 1960's to growth counties in the 1970's. These counties contained 106 small towns under 10,000 population, with about two-thirds of those being under 1,000 in size. As might be expected, the places in the turnaround counties had higher rates than those in the rest of the state. (Table 4) About 40 percent of all nonmetropolitan small towns grew in the 1970's compared with 48 percent of the turnaround places. There appears to be no particular size relationship in the places in this part of the state. However, it may be significant that the few larger places in the region were not particularly growth areas. The bulk of the growth places were in smaller size classes.

Since the turnaround area represents the declining population area of Ohio in the 1960's, it is not surprising that the small towns here showed more population loss than growth. There were twice as many places in the loss column as in the gain column in that decade. The most dramatic turnaround over the two decades shows up in places under 500 in population, where only 17 percent were growth towns in the first decade compared to 42 percent in the past decade. Likewise, the number of losers dropped from 58 percent to 26 percent.

NONPLACE GROWTH

To complete the picture of population change, it is instructive to look at growth and decline in areas outside of the incorporated places in the state. Table 5 presents change data for incorporated and unincorporated areas broken down by metropolitan status. Ohio's total growth of 1.3 percent in the 1970's was a result of 9.3 percent nonmetropolitan growth combined with 0.6 percent loss in metropolitan population. The major growth areas were in large and medium fringe metropolitan counties and in the two classes of nonmetropolitan counties with the smallest "size of largest place". In fact, the 18.5 percent growth in nonmetropolitan counties with largest places under 5,000 is the highest growth rate of all categories.

Without exception, the unincorporated areas of Ohio grew more than the incorporated places, with the differences substantial in most cases. All metropolitan core categories showed population loss in the aggregate incorporated area and growth in the unincorporated areas. Metropolitan fringe patterns were similar, except both incorporated and unincorporated areas showed growth, with the outlying areas more than doubling the growth in places. The pattern is even more pronounced in nonmetropolitan counties. In each of the three size categories, the unincorporated population growth far outpaces the change in places. The 25 percent increase in unincorporated area in counties with a largest place under 5,000 is highest rate in Table 5.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Ohio changed from a growth state in the 1960's to a no growth state in the 1970's. Population growth in small towns reflected this change, although small town growth declined less than that of larger places. The size relationship remained intact, with larger small towns faring better than the very small places. There were, however, more substantial changes when metropolitan status and size were taken into consideration. Places in metropolitan core counties, which had the highest growth rate in the 1960's, had the lowest growth rates in the the 1970's. Towns in the smaller nonmetropolitan counties actually had higher growth rates in the latter decade, compared to the former, despite the state's overall lower growth.

Places in Ohio's rural turnaround counties, essentially the Appalachian region of the state, had remarkably higher growth in the 1970's. This was true for places of all sizes, including the very smallest, which showed a majority losing population in the 1960's.

An analysis of aggregate population change in incorporated and unincorporated areas revealed much higher growth rates in the outlying areas than in places. Metropolitan fringe counties and nonmetropolitan counties showed similar high growth rates in their unincorporated areas. The outlying regions in metropolitan core counties also grew faster than the place population, but the rates were considerably lower than in fringe and nonmetropolitan counties.

To those who have followed the literature on the rural turnaround, the results of this research contain few, if any, surprises. In most cases, the pattern of growth in the 1970's is the reverse of the 1960's pattern. The demographics of the 1970-80 decade were not foreseen. In Ohio, the growth in the Appalachian area was the last area that anyone would have predicted to grow. A forecast of growth in the smaller, more remote places would likewise have been viewed as foolish prior to 1970.

The most important question at this point is "what can we expect in the 1980's?" Census Bureau estimates show that the growth in Ohio's turnaround counties has slowed. Half of these counties continued to grow through 1984, with the other half showing no growth or small declines. Data with which to analyze place data is not yet available for this period. With the analysis from this paper, however, we now have a benchmark in place so that comparisons can be readily made when place estimates become available.

LITERATURE CITED

Bryce, H., ed. 1977. Small Cities in Transition: the Dynamics of Growth and Decline. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

Fuguitt, G.V., Beale, C.L. 1976. Post-1970 Shifts in the Pattern of Population Change in the North Central Region. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society, St. Louis.

Fuguitt, G.V., Beale, C.L. 1977. "Recent Trends in City Population Growth and Distribution." In Bryce 1977, pp. 13-27.

Fuguitt, G.V., Lichter, D.T., Beale, C.L. 1981. Population Deconcentration in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas of the United States, 1950-1975. Poulation Series 70-15, Appl. Pop. Lab., Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison.

Fuguitt, G.V. 1985. "The Nonmetropolitan Population Turnaround". Ann. Rev. Sociol. 11:259-80.

Lichter, D.T., Fuguitt, G.V. 1982. "The Transition to Nonmetropolitan Population Deconcentration." Demography 19:211-21.

Long, J.F. 1978. The Deconcentration of Nonmetropolitan Population. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Ass'n of America, Atlanta.

Long, J.F. 1981. Population Deconcentration in the United States. Spec. Demog. Anal. CDS-81-S. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Long, J.F., DeAre, D. 1982. "Repopulating the Countryside: a 1980 Census Trend." Science 217:1111-6.

Table 1. Growth and Decline of Ohio Places, 1970-1980 and 1960-1970, by Size Class.

SIZE OF PLACE	1970-80 NO. OF PLACES	1970-80 GROW	1970-80 STABLE	1970-80 LOSS*	1960-70 NO. OF PLACES	1960-70 GROW	1960-70 STABLE	1960-70 LOSS
ALL PLACES	965	37.5	29.7	32.7	932	54.4	25.5	20.1
OVER 10,000	151	27.2	27.8	45.0	114	56.1	29.8	14.0
UNDER 10,000	814	39.4	34.8	25.3	818	54.2	24.9	25.5
5,000-9,999	89	48.3	25.8	25.8	76	68.4	21.1	10.5
2,500-4,999	104	45.2	27.9	26.9	102	68.6	16.7	14.7
1,000-2,499	195	46.7	29.2	24.1	196	63.3	24.5	12.2
500-999	177	39.0	27.7	33.3	183	53.6	30.1	16.4
UNDER 500	249	28.5	34.9	36.5	261	37.9	26.1	36.0

* Grow = 5.0% +, Stable = -4.9% to +4.9%, Loss = -5.0% and over

Table 2. Growth and Decline of Ohio Places, 1970-1980 and 1960-1970, by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Status.

METROPOLITAN STATUS*	1970-80 NO. OF PLACES	1970-80 GROW	1970-80 STABLE	1970-80 LOSS*	1960-70 NO. OF PLACES	1960-70 GROW	1960-70 STABLE	1960-70 LOSS
UNDER 10,000								
METRO CORE	208	35.1	22.6	42.3	221	67.0	17.6	15.4
METRO FRINGE	218	42.7	28.9	28.4	213	54.5	27.2	18.3
NON METRO	388	39.9	34.8	25.3	384	46.6	27.9	25.5

* Core = Counties containing a Central City of an SMSA as of 1974.
Fringe = all non-core SMSA counties.

Table 3. Growth and Decline of Ohio Places, 1970-1980 and 1960-1970, by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Status and Size.

METROPOLITAN STATUS AND SIZE*	1970-80 NO. OF PLACES	GROW	STABLE	LOSS*	1960-70 NO. OF PLACES	GROW	STABLE	LOSS
(PLACES UNDER 10,000)								
METROPOLITAN								
CORE LARGE	91	35.2	16.5	48.4	105	79.0	12.4	8.6
CORE MEDIUM	64	43.8	23.4	32.8	65	64.6	16.9	18.5
CORE SMALL	53	24.5	32.1	43.4	51	45.1	29.4	25.5
FRINGE LARGE	148	40.5	30.4	29.1	147	61.2	23.1	15.6
FRINGE MEDIUM	20	55.0	25.0	20.0	17	23.5	29.4	47.1
FRINGE SMALL	50	44.0	26.0	30.0	49	44.9	38.8	16.3
NONMETROPOLITAN								
SLP 10,000+	227	37.4	35.2	27.3	223	55.2	23.3	21.5
SLP 5,000-9,999	81	42.0	34.6	23.5	81	40.7	28.4	30.9
SLP UNDER 5,000	80	45.0	33.8	21.2	80	28.8	40.0	31.2
TOTAL	814	39.4	30.1	30.5	818	54.2	24.9	20.9

* Metro Large = Central City over 250,000
Metro Fringe = Central City 100,000- 249,999
Metro Small = Central City under 100,000
Nonmetro SLP = Size of largest place in county

Table 4. Growth and Decline of Ohio Places, 1970-1980 and 1960-1970 in Rural Turnaround Counties, by Size of Place. *

SIZE OF PLACE	1970-80 NO. OF PLACES	GROW	STABLE	LOSS*	1960-70 NO. OF PLACES	GROW	STABLE	LOSS
UNDER 10,000	106	48.1	29.2	22.6	104	23.1	30.8	46.2
5,000-9,999	6	33.3	16.7	50.0	6	0.0	50.0	50.0
2,500-4,999	14	57.1	21.4	21.4	12	41.7	16.7	41.7
1,000-2,499	21	47.6	38.1	14.3	24	25.0	37.5	37.5
500-999	22	59.1	22.7	18.2	21	28.6	38.1	33.3
UNDER 500	43	41.9	32.6	25.6	41	17.1	24.4	58.5

* Rural turnaround counties = 16 counties that lost population 1960-70 and gained population 1970-80.

Table 5. Ohio Population in Incorporated and Unincorporated Areas, by Metropolitan Status, 1970 and 1980.

	1980 POPULATION			1970 POPULATION			PERCENT CHANGE		
METRO STATUS	TOTAL	INCORP	UNINC	TOTAL	INCORP	UNINC	TOTAL	INCORP	UNINC
CORE LARGE	4,284,194	3,693,860	590,334	4,571,992	3,993,583	578,409	-6.3	-7.5	2.1
CORE MEDIUM	1,968,341	1,277,184	691,157	1,945,755	1,339,611	606,144	1.2	-4.7	14.0
CORE SMALL	549,512	310,519	238,993	551,609	332,623	218,986	-.4	-6.6	9.1
CORE TOTAL	6,802,047	5,281,563	1,520,484	7,069,356	5,665,817	1,403,539	-3.8	-6.8	8.3
FRINGE LARGE	1,295,940	692,151	603,789	1,112,379	619,867	492,512	16.5	11.7	22.6
FRINGE MEDIUM	225,303	96,497	128,806	204,315	95,268	109,047	10.3	1.3	18.1
FRINGE SMALL	222,221	118,222	103,999	210,338	117,655	92,683	5.6	.5	12.2
FRINGE TOTAL	1,743,464	906,870	836,594	1,527,032	832,790	694,242	14.2	8.9	20.5
METRO TOTAL	8,545,511	6,188,433	2,357,078	8,596,388	6,498,607	2,097,781	-.6	-4.8	12.4
SLP-10,000+	1,662,066	881,712	780,354	1,545,979	889,187	656,792	7.5	-.8	18.8
SLP- 5,000-9,999	337,495	158,141	179,354	301,875	150,666	151,209	11.8	5.0	18.6
SLP- UNDER 5,000	252,558	80,783	171,775	213,181	76,137	137,044	18.5	6.1	25.3
NON-METRO TOTAL	2,252,119	1,120,636	1,131,483	2,061,035	1,115,990	945,045	9.3	.4	19.7
TOTAL	10,797,630	7,309,069	3,488,561	10,657,423	7,614,597	3,042,826	1.3	-4.0	14.6